

Appln. No. 09/726,076

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1955

III. Remarks

By this paper, Applicants are amending Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10-12 and 14-17. Therefore, after entering this amendment, claims 1-19 are currently pending.

Reconsideration and further examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is therefore respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 1, 10, and 14 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Furthermore, Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 2-9, 11-13, and 15-19 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, Applicants have amended claims 1-4, 7-8, 10-12, and 14-17, as will be discussed in detail below. Therefore, Applicants assert that claims 1-19 are allowable for the reasons below, and such action is requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7-8, 10-12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 1 has been rejected as being incomplete for omitting essential steps because the Examiner asserts that it is unclear how the following steps are realized: the steps involved with the selection of the design for the power steering system and the steps for the selection of the predetermined characteristic of the power steering system.

Responsive to these rejections, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite the step of *obtaining* a design for the power steering system and the step of *obtaining* the predetermined characteristic of the power steering system. (Emphasis added). As disclosed on page 15, lines 6-22 in the original Application as filed, the step of obtaining a design for the power steering system can be performed by either the system user or by the computer, and the design can be selected from the

BRINKS
HOFER
GILSON
ALIONE

-8-

Appln. No. 09/728,076

Attorney Docket No. 10641-1956

knowledge-based engineering library or created by a design tool. Furthermore, as disclosed on page 17, lines 4-14 in the original Application as filed, the step of obtaining a predetermined characteristic of the power steering system can be performed by the system user. Therefore, it is clear how both of these steps recited in claim 1 are realized, and the rejections should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 has also been rejected as being indefinite based on the recited terms/steps, "selecting a design for a power steering system", "meet a predetermined noise criteria", "using a power steering hose assembly design", "power steering hose assembly design", and "meet a predetermined criteria".

Responsive to these rejections, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite the steps/terms of, "*obtaining* a design for *the* power steering system", "meet *the* predetermined noise criteria", "using *the* power steering hose assembly design", and "meet *the* predetermined *noise* criteria". (Emphasis added). Therefore, the rejections of claim 1 are moot, and claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 10 has been rejected as being incomplete for omitting essential steps because the Examiner asserts that it is unclear how the following steps are realized: the steps involved with the selection of the design for the power steering system and the steps for the selection of the property of the power steering fluid and the property of the power steering pump.

Responsive to these rejections, Applicants have amended claim 10 to recite the step of *obtaining* a design for the power steering system, the step of *obtaining* a property of a power steering fluid, and the step of *obtaining* a property of a power steering pump. (Emphasis added). As disclosed on page 15, lines 6-22 in the original Application as filed, the step of obtaining a design for the power steering system can be performed by either the system user or by the computer, and the design can be selected from the knowledge-based engineering library or created by a design tool. Furthermore, as disclosed on page 16, lines 12-21 in the original Application as filed, the step of obtaining a property of a power steering fluid can be performed by the system user. Additionally, as disclosed on page 17, lines 4-14 in the original Application as filed, the step of obtaining a property of a power steering pump can be performed by the system user. Therefore, it is clear how all three of these steps recited in claim 10 are realized, and the rejections should be withdrawn.

-9-

BRINKS
HOFER
GILSON
ALONE

Appln. No. 09/726,076

Attorney Docket No. 10641-1955

Claim 10 has also been rejected as being indefinite based on the recited terms/steps, "selecting a design for a power steering system" and "at a predetermined operating condition".

Responsive to these rejections, Applicants have amended claim 10 to recite the steps/terms of, "*obtaining* a design for *the* power steering system" and "*at the* predetermined operating condition". (Emphasis added). Therefore, the rejections of claim 10 are moot, and claim 10 is allowable.

Claim 14 has been rejected as being incomplete for omitting essential steps because the Examiner asserts that it is unclear how the following steps are realized: the steps involved with the selection of the design for hydraulic energy / assistance system and the steps for the selection of the predetermined characteristic of the hydraulic energy assistance system.

Responsive to these rejections, Applicants have amended claim 14 to recite the step of *obtaining* a design for the hydraulic energy assistance system and the step of *obtaining* a predetermined characteristic of the hydraulic energy / assistance system. The term "hydraulic energy assistance system" includes, but is not limited to, a power steering system. As disclosed on page 15, lines 6-22 in the original Application as filed, the step of obtaining a design for the power steering system can be performed by either the system user or by the computer, and the design can be selected from the knowledge-based engineering library or created by a design tool. Furthermore, as disclosed on page 17, lines 4-14 in the original Application as filed, the step of obtaining a predetermined characteristic of the power steering system can be performed by the system user. Therefore, it is clear how both of the steps recited in claim 14 are realized, and the rejections should be withdrawn.

Claim 14 has also been rejected as being indefinite based on the recited terms/steps, "for a hydraulic energy assistance system" and "meet a predetermined criteria".

Responsive to these rejections, Applicants have amended claim 14 to recite the steps/terms of, "*obtaining* a design for *the* hydraulic energy assistance system" and "*meet the* predetermined *noise* criteria". (Emphasis added). Therefore, the rejections of claim 14 are moot, and claim 14 is allowable.

BRINKS
HOFFER
GILSON
ALLONE

-10-

Appln. No. 09/726,076

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1955

Claims 2 and 11 have been rejected as being indefinite based on the recited terms, "a power steering system" and "a model". Responsive to these rejections, Applicants have amended claims 2 and 11 to recite the terms, "*obtaining the design for the power steering system*" and "*the mesh model*". (Emphasis added). Therefore, the rejections of claims 2 and 11 are moot, and these claims are allowable.

Claims 3 and 4 have been rejected as being indefinite based on the recited terms, "a predetermined characteristic" and "a predetermined operating condition". Responsive to these rejections, Applicants have amended claims 3 and 4 to recite the terms, "*the predetermined characteristic*" and "*the predetermined operating condition*". (Emphasis added). Therefore, the rejections of claims 3 and 4 are moot, and these claims are allowable.

Claim 7 has been rejected as being indefinite based on the recited term, "a noise transmission loss". Responsive to this rejection, Applicants have amended claim 7 to recite, "*the transmission loss*". (Emphasis added). Therefore, the rejection of claim 7 is moot, and this claim is allowable.

Claims 8 and 12 have been rejected as being indefinite based on the recited term, "a predetermined criteria". Responsive to these rejections, Applicants have amended claims 8 and 12 to recite, "*the predetermined noise criteria*". (Emphasis added). Therefore, the rejections of claims 8 and 12 are moot, and these claims are allowable.

Claim 15 has been rejected as being indefinite based on the recited term, "an acoustic analysis". Responsive to this rejection, Applicants have amended claim 15 to recite, "*the acoustic analysis*". (Emphasis added). Therefore, the rejection of claim 15 is moot, and this claim is allowable.

Claim 16 has been rejected as being indefinite based on the recited terms, "an acoustic analysis" and "an acoustic response". The term "an acoustic analysis" is not present in claim 16, and therefore this rejection should be withdrawn.

-11-

BRINKS
HOFER
GILSON
ALJONE

Appln. No. 09/726,076

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1955

Responsive to the remaining rejection, Applicants have amended claim 16 to recite, "the acoustic response" in line 2 and in line 3. (Emphasis added). Therefore, the rejection of claim 16 is moot, and this claim is allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney for the Applicants via telephone number (734) 302-6000, if such communication would expedite this application.

Respectfully submitted,


Eric J. Sosenko (Reg. No. 84,440)

BRINKS
HOFER
GILSON
ELIONE

-12-